

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-34 are pending in the application, with 5, 18, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 1-4 were previously canceled. Claims 5-14 are currently sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claim 18 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 19-34 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(i) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p). Applicant submits herewith copies of twelve (12) sheets of replacement drawings (containing Figures 1A-11). The replacement drawings add no new matter to this application. Applicant requests that the Examiner approve the replacement drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,694,065 to Hamasaki et al. (hereinafter Hamasaki). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 15 recites:

A circuit, comprising:

 a buffer;
 a sampling circuit having a switch; and
 a damping circuit coupled between the buffer and the sampling circuit;
 wherein the damping circuit is adapted to reduce charge glitches when the switch closes.

(See claim 15, *emphasis added*)

The Office Action relies on switches 50 and 60 of Hamasaki to allegedly teach the sampling circuit of Applicants' claim 15. However, upon inspection, switches 50 and 60 (FIG. 2 of Hamasaki) are merely inverters and do not constitute a sampling circuit. Switches 50 and 60 are not even capable of storing a charge of a sample. Thus, Hamasaki fails to teach or suggest *a sampling circuit*, as set forth in independent claim 15. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15.

Furthermore, claims 16-17, which depend from independent claim 15, also distinguish over Hamasaki for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 15, and further in view of their own features.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 18 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 18 has been amended accordingly and, therefore, should also be allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



for Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

39,987

Date: 1/18/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600